DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 551 JC 870 493

AUTHOR Tichenor, Richard
TITLE St. Louis Community College Nonreturning Students: Retention Problems or Success Stories?
INSTITUTION Saint Louis Community Coll., MO. Office of Institutional Research and Planning.
PUB DATE 9 Jan 87
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Dropout Characteristics; *Dropouts; Enrollment Influences; Questionnaires; School Surveys; *Stopouts; *Student Educational Objectives; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students; Withdrawal (Education)

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted at St. Louis (Missouri) Community College (SLCC) to assess the extent to which data on nonreturning students represent retention problems, the achievement of non-degree goals, or the process of temporarily stopping out. Study findings, based on a 27% response to a summer 1986 survey of 1,706 fall 1985 students who did not re-enroll for the spring 1986 semester, coupled with demographic information from the college's student data system, included the following: (1) districtwide, only 16% of the nonreturning students had permanently dropped out without accomplishing their educational goals, 37% had achieved their goals, and 47% had not yet accomplished their goals, but planned to return to SLCC; (2) 24% of the full-time and 40% of the part-time nonreturning students had achieved their educational goals; (3) approximately 80% of the students who had been pursuing an associate in arts (AA) or associate in applied science (AAS) degree were classified as "stop outs"; and (4) students with a career training educational goal had the highest dropout rate (25%), followed by students with an certificate educational goal (22%), students with an AAS degree goal (20%), students with an AA degree goal (19%), students with a personal interest educational goal (14%), and students with an "improve job skills" educational goal (11%). The study report includes findings for the district as a whole and for each campus, along with a discussion of the implications of the study findings. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED287551

TM 87 - 14

ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NONRETURNING STUDENTS:

RETENTION PROBLEMS OR SUCCESS STORIES?

January 9, 1987

Prepared By:

Richard Tichenor
Management Information Analyst

Inquiries regarding this document should be made to:

Office of Institutional Research and Planning
St. Louis Community College
5801 Wilson Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63110

JC 870493

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard Tichenor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is one of a series of reports which analyze survey data for St. Louis Community College nonreturning students. This data was collected to supplement the nonreturning student data files which are extracted from the College's regular student data system. The supplemental data allows us to examine important questions regarding nonreturning students which have not previously been addressed. The specific question addressed by this report is the extent to which nonreturns represent retention problems (drop-outs), success stories (non-degree goal achievers), and continuing stories (temporary stop-outs).

The basic findings indicate the following.

---- District-wide, only 16% of the nonreturning students have permanently dropped out without accomplishing their educational goals; 37% have achieved their goal; and the largest percentage, 47%, have not yet accomplished their goals, but plan to return to SLCC.

---- At the Forest Park campus, only 14% of the nonreturning students are drop-outs, 39% have achieved their educational goals, and 48% plan to return.

---- At the Florissant Valley campus, only 12% of the nonreturning students are drop-outs, 33% have achieved their educational goals, and 55% plan to return.

---- At the Meramec campus, only 18% of the nonreturning students have dropped out, 40% have achieved their educational goals, and 42% plan to return.

The report also presents findings for subsets of the District and campus nonreturning students. The subsets are based on the students' former enrollment status (full time or part time) and their educational goals (AAS, AA, Certificate, General Transfer, Personal Interest, Career Training, or Improve Job Skills).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

PREFACE iii-iv

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2: ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

FINDINGS 2-5

IMPLICATIONS 5-7

CHAPTER 3: FOREST PARK

FINDINGS 8-9

IMPLICATIONS 9-10

CHAPTER 4: FLORISSANT VALLEY

FINDINGS 11-12

IMPLICATIONS 12-13

CHAPTER 5: MERAMEC

FINDINGS 14-15

IMPLICATIONS 15-16

APPENDIX I: SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE 17

APPENDIX II: COVER LETTER 19

PREFACE

BACKGROUND

Information regarding nonreturning students is central to an understanding of both retention and student outcomes at a community college. Recognizing the importance of such information, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning began producing Nonreturning Student Profiles in the 1984-85 academic year. These annual profiles provide demographic information on those students who were enrolled at St. Louis Community College for the Fall semester, did not graduate, and did not return for the Spring semester. In the 1985-86 academic year an additional, somewhat more analytical, report was also produced. All of these reports have, however, relied exclusively on data extracted from the College's student data system. As a result, important questions which are beyond the scope of that data base could not be answered. In order to address these additional questions, the Institutional Research and Planning Office has now developed survey based nonreturning student data to supplement the data extracted from the student system.

METHODOLGY AND SURVEY RESPONSE

The supplemental data base was developed by surveying a sample of of Fall 1985 students who did not graduate, and did not re-enroll for the Spring 1986 semester. Each year nonreturning students are identified by comparing the Fall Census Date CAS (Currently Active Student) file, the Spring Census Date CAS file, and the Fall graduate file. A copy of all data for Fall students not found in either the Spring or graduate files is extracted from the Fall file and saved as the nonreturning student file. The survey sample was selected by writing an Easytrieve program which first sorted the nonreturning student file for the 1985-86 academic year by campus and student educational goal, and then selected every sixth student within each educational goal category. (Due to the relatively small number of Certificate students, every fifth student was selected in this goal category, while the number of Pre-Entry students was so small that they were excluded from survey.)

During the summer of 1986 the survey instrument was mailed to this sample of nonreturning students, a total of 1706 former students. After approximately six weeks, the response rate was 13%. A second mailing of the questionnaire with an accompanying cover letter was made at that time resulting in a final sample of 458 students, a 27% response rate. Approximately 2% of the surveys were returned by the postal service as undeliverable.

The response rates within the individual educational goal subsets of the sample were as follows: AAS 24%; AA 27%; Certificate 50%; General Transfer 25%; Personal Interest 21%; Career Training 22%; and

Improve Job Skills 31%. Response rates for the individual campuses were 28% for Forest Park, 26% for Florissant Valley, and 24% for Meramec.

A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix I. The questionnaires sent to students in the various educational goal categories differed only in the goal indicated in the first question. The cover letter which accompanied the second mailing is included a Appendix II.

The survey responses have been compiled in an SPSS-X data file and are summarized and analyzed using the SPSS-X statistical software.

USE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL DATA BASE

This report is but one of series of reports deriving information from this supplemental data base. A number of these reports have or will be initiated internally at the Office of Institutional Research and Planning. Additional reports can be initiated by specific requests from management information users throughout the St. Louis Community College District. Institutional Research and Planning encourages users to examine the survey instrument, and request analyses that address their information needs in regard to nonreturning students.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Serving the educational goals of non-degree students is an important and well established part of the mission of St. Louis Community College. SLCC also provides educational opportunity to students who, by choice or necessity, pursue their educational goals on an intermittent basis. Since there is no formal documentation of non-degree goal achievement, or regular collection of information on future enrollment plans, regular student data files do not distinguish these goal achievers, and stop-outs from nonreturning students who have permanently dropped out without achieving their educational goals. The purpose of this report is to present evidence from the survey-derived supplemental data base regarding goal achievement, stop-out, and drop-out percentages for St. Louis Community College's nonreturning students.

A sample of the questionnaire used to develop the supplemental data base is presented as Appendix I of this report. The findings presented in this report are based on the responses to survey questions 1 and 5. Goal Achievers were identified on the basis of a "yes" response to survey question 1: "Did you accomplish your goal?" Stop-outs were identified on the basis of a "no" response to question 1, combined with a "yes" response to question 5: "Do you plan to re-enroll at St. Louis Community College in the future? Drop-outs were identified on the basis of a "no" response to both questions 1 and 5.

The data is examined both for the District as a whole, and at the individual campus level. In each case, percentages of goal achievers, stop-outs, and drop-outs are presented for all respondents from the unit of analysis (District or campus), for subsets based on the respondents' educational goals, and for subsets based on their Fall enrollment status. Percentages are also presented for enrollment status subsets within the educational goal subsets.

Fall enrollment status was determined on the basis of the response to the question: "How many credit hours did you take in the Fall, 1985 semester?". Those indicating 12 or more hours were included in the full time subset. Those indicating fewer than 12 hours were included in the part time subset. Approximately 11% of the respondents did not answer this question, and were therefore not included in the calculations of percentages for enrollment status subsets.

Educational goal subsets were based on goals as indicated on the Fall 1985 student registration. Since this information was part of the sampling procedure it was pre-printed on the survey.

Chapter two examines the data for the District as a whole, while Chapters 3 through 5 provide separate campus level examinations for Forest Park, Florissant Valley and Meramec, respectively. In all four chapters, the "Findings" are presented in the form of concise text tables, with a brief narrative included in the District chapter. The "Findings" section of each chapter is followed immediately by an "Implications" section for that particular chapter.

CHAPTER 2
ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

FINDINGS

ALL RESPONDENTS

Well over one-third of the respondents to the nonreturning student survey had achieved their educational goal at St. Louis Community College. A relatively small percentage had permanently dropped out with their goal unfulfilled. The largest percentage of respondents, almost one-half, must be regarded as stop-outs. The responses of nonreturning students who had been full time students in the Fall of 1985 indicate a somewhat higher stop-out percentage, and a notably higher drop-out percentage than those of their part time counterparts. The percentages (to the nearest whole percent) of goal achievers, stop-outs and drop-outs among all respondents, and the full time and part time subsets are:

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	37%	24%	40%
STOP-OUTS	47%	52%	46%
DROP-OUTS	16%	24%	14%

Of those respondents designated as stop-outs, 4% had already enrolled for the Summer 1986 session, and total of 58% indicated they would be re-enrolled by the Fall 1986 semester.

RESPONDENTS WITH AN AAS EDUCATIONAL GOAL

Based on their survey responses, approximately four-fifths of the respondents which had been pursuing an AAS degree in the Fall of 1986 will return to St. Louis Community College, while one-fifth will not return. These proportions are roughly the same among both former full time and part time students. The percentage breakdowns of goal achievers, stop-outs, and drop-outs among all AAS goal respondents, and the AAS respondents in the Fall enrollment status subsets are:

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	1%	-	2%
STOP-OUTS	79%	80%	79%
DROP-OUTS	20%	20%	19%

Those students who achieved their AAS degree goal are, of course, graduates, and by definition not part of the nonreturning student statistics. The goal achievement noted here reflects a change of goal during the Fall semester, and achievement of the new non-degree goal.

RESPONDENTS WITH AN AA EDUCATIONAL GOAL

Like AAS respondents, AA goal respondents as a whole are roughly four-fifths stop-outs, one-fifth drop-outs. There is, however, notable variation from those proportions within the AA full time subset. The percentage distributions for AA respondents in the aggregate and within each enrollment subset are:

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	2%	9%	-
STOP-OUTS	80%	55%	85%
DROP-OUTS	19%	36%	15%

Here too, the goal achievement percentages reflect accomplishment of revised (non-degree) goals.

RESPONDENTS WITH A CERTIFICATE EDUCATIONAL GOAL

Based on the survey responses, goal revision and revised goal achievement is particularly prevalent among students having declared a Certificate goal. Almost one third of the respondents in this degree goal subset indicated achievement of a new non-degree goal. Revised goal achievement was a more commonly reported outcome than was dropping out, with only a little over a fifth of the the respondents in this group indicating they had dropped out. There is a fairly high drop-out percentage for Certificate respondents in the full time subset, however. While goal achievement was a common response in that subset, it was most prevalent among the former part time students. Stop-outs comprised close to one-half of both enrollment subsets. The percentage distributions are:

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	31%	17%	39%
STOP-OUTS	47%	50%	45%
DROP-OUTS	22%	33%	16%

RESPONDENTS WITH A GENERAL TRANSFER EDUCATIONAL GOAL

The drop-out percentage for General Transfer respondents is the lowest of all the educational goal subsets. Approximately one-half of the General Transfer goal respondents had accomplished their goal, and most of those who had not, indicated that they would be returning to to SLCC. Goal achievement was highest in the part time subset, while the stop-out percentage was highest among the former full time students. The percentages are:

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	49%	36%	55%
STOP-OUTS	41%	55%	36%
DROP-OUTS	10%	9%	9%

RESPONDENTS WITH A PERSONAL INTEREST EDUCATIONAL GOAL

The goal achievement percentage for respondents with Personal Interest goals is higher than for any other educational goal subset, and the stop-out percentage is lower than is true for the other goals. The achievement percentages for Personal Interest respondents are fairly similar within each enrollment status subset. However, those in the full time subset who had not accomplished their goal had dropped out, while most of their counterparts in the part time subset planned to re-enroll. The percentages are:

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	69%	67%	72%
STOP-OUTS	16%	-	18%
DROP-OUTS	14%	33%	10%

RESPONDENTS WITH A CAREER TRAINING EDUCATIONAL GOAL

While close to half of the Career Training goal respondents had achieved their goal, one-fourth had dropped out. This is the largest percentage of drop-outs found in any of the educational goal subsets viewed as a whole. Career Training respondents in the full time subset either accomplished their goal or dropped out, with the vast majority accomplishing their goal, while respondents in the part time subset were more evenly distributed over the three categories of nonreturning students. The percentage distributions are:

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	45%	80%	42%
STOP-OUTS	30%	-	36%
DROP-OUTS	25%	20%	23%

RESPONDENTS WITH AN IMPROVE JOB SKILLS EDUCATIONAL GOAL

The goal achievement percentage for respondents seeking to Improve Job Skills is second only to that of respondents with Personal Interest goals, and only General Transfer respondents have a lower drop-out percentage. The Improve Job Skills percentages are:

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	63%	100%	64%
STOP-OUTS	26%	-	26%
DROP-OUTS	11%	-	11%

The percentages for all respondents with this goal and those in the part time subset are virtually identical because there are very few full time students with this educational goal.

IMPLICATIONS

ATTRITION

The findings clearly emphasize the dangers of equating nonreturn rates at the Community College with attrition rates. They also provide a quantitative basis for estimating attrition rates. If the 16% drop-out percentage indicated by the survey results is representative of nonreturning students in general, multiplication of that rate by the aggregate nonreturn rate yields the aggregate attrition rate for the semester. In the semester in question, approximately 40% of the head-count did not return for the subsequent semester. If only 16% of the nonreturning students were drop-outs, then the semester attrition rate for the student body as whole was only 6% (16% of 40%). In terms of headcount the implication is that, out of an enrollment of close to 29,000 with 11,658 nonreturning non-graduates, only a little over 1800 were drop-outs.

THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY

In addition to the student body which is visible on the campuses, and in the enrollment statistics for a given semester, there is also an "invisible" student body. These are the students who are not enrolled for that particular semester, but who have begun a pursuit of their educational goals at SLCC which they will continue through intermittent enrollment. The findings regarding stop-out percentages imply that movement from the visible to this "invisible" portion of the College's total clientele accounts for almost half (47%) of SLCC's nonreturning students. This would have been approximately 19% (47% of 40%) of the Fall 1985 enrollment, or about 5400 students. Eighteen percent of that enrollment had been drawn from the "invisible" student body, so there was a roughly offsetting exchange (a small net addition to the "invisible" student body).

Some of the stop-outs will undoubtedly eventually become drop-outs (as will some of the continuing students). There is, however, ample evidence of substantial re-entry. Re-entry statistics reported in Student Body Profiles reveal that from Fall 1980 through Fall 1986 re-entry students have numbered at least 4000 in every semester, and have never comprised less than 14% of semester enrollment. There is

also some indication that in recent years the "invisible" pool of temporarily inactive students has become an increasing important source of "visible" enrollment. After comprising 16% of Fall enrollment from 1980 through 1983, re-entry students have increased to 17%, 18%, and 20% of Fall enrollments in 1984, 1985 and 1986, respectively. In Fall of 1986, re-entry students not only comprised 20% of enrollment, but also reached an all time high headcount of over 5,700. Survey findings regarding planned semester of re-enrollment imply that over 3100 of these students were Fall 1985 students who stopped out Spring semester.

UNDOCUMENTED ACHIEVEMENT

The survey findings also suggest that a majority of the student educational goal achievement at the Community College is "invisible", in that it is achievement for which their is no formal documentation. The aggregate goal achievement percentage of 37% implies that 15% of the Fall 1985 student body (37% of 40%) achieved non-degree educational goals. Even allowing for considerable error in this estimate of non-degree goal achievement, there is a clear implication that the number of formal graduates drastically understates the total number of St. Louis Community College student "success stories". During the 1985-86 academic year 2301 degrees (including Certificates) were awarded, while the implied number of students achieving non-degree in the Fall semester alone is approximately 4300.

SUBSET IMPLICATIONS

Previous research found that the nonreturn rate for part time students was more than twice the nonreturn rate for full time students. The survey findings imply that this difference is accounted for almost entirely by more stop-outs and undocumented goal achievement among part time students. The implied attrition rates for part time and full time students are very similar. When the drop-out, stop-out, and achievement percentages for each enrollment status subset are multiplied by their respective nonreturn rates (21% for full time and 45% for part time), the results are as follows.

ENROLLMENT STATUS	ATTRITION RATE	PERCENTAGE JOINING THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY	PERCENTAGE WITH UNDOCUMENTED (NON-DEGREE) GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
FULL TIME	5%	11%	5%
PART TIME	6%	21%	18%

The findings also imply attrition rates for educational goal subsets which are both much smaller and more uniform than the subset nonreturn rates. For instance, previously determined nonreturn rates ranged from 26% for students with an AAS goal to 63% for those with an Improve Job Skills goal, but when the survey determined drop-out

percentages are applied to those rates the resulting attrition rates are quite similar; 5% (20% of 26%) for AAS students, and 7% (11% of 63%) for Improve Job Skills students. The highest implied attrition rate was found in the Career Training subset. That rate of 12% (a 25% drop-out percentage with 49% nonreturn rate) was the only subset attrition rate which varied more than 3 percentage points from the implied aggregate rate of 6%. The complete list of results from multiplying subset non-return rates by drop-out, stop-out, and achievement percentages follows.

GOAL	ATTRITION RATE	PERCENTAGE JOINING THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY	PERCENTAGE WITH UNDOCUMENTED (NON-DEGREE) GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
AAS	5%	21%	-
AA	6%	24%	1%
CERTIFICATE	9%	20%	13%
GENERAL TRANSFER	4%	16%	19%
PERSONAL INTEREST	8%	9%	39%
CAREER TRAINING	12%	15%	22%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	7%	16%	40%

As can be seen in the listing, undocumented goal achievement was substantial in all nondegree goal subsets. This largely accounts for a previous finding that nonreturn rates for non-degree students were higher those of degree goal students. Stop-outs appear somewhat more prominent in degree goal subsets, but, with the exception of Personal Interest students, it appears that about one-sixth of non-degree students also stop-out.

The general implications for enrollment subsets within the educational goal subsets (results of calculations are not shown) are basically the same as those already noted with respect to the larger subsets. Differences between subset nonreturn rates are due primarily to differences in stop-outs and undocumented goal achievement, not attrition.

CHAPTER 3
FOREST PARK CAMPUS

FINDINGS

ALL RESPONDENTS

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	39%	20%	46%
STOP-OUTS	48%	60%	41%
DROP-OUTS	14%	20%	13%

RESPONDENTS WITH AN AAS EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	-	-	-
STOP-OUTS	88%	100%	75%
DROP-OUTS	13%	-	25%

RESPONDENTS WITH AN AA EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	-	-	-
STOP-OUTS	73%	60%	75%
DROP-OUTS	27%	40%	25%

RESPONDENTS WITH A CERTIFICATE EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	43%	-	40%
STOP-OUTS	57%	100%	60%
DROP-OUTS	-	-	-

RESPONDENTS WITH A GENERAL TRANSFER EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	31%	50%	33%
STOP-OUTS	62%	50%	56%
DROP-OUTS	8%	-	11%

RESPONDENTS WITH A PERSONAL INTEREST EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	71%	100%	73%
STOP-OUTS	24%	-	27%
DROP-OUTS	6%	-	-

RESPONDENTS WITH A CAREER TRAINING EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	27%	50%	25%
STOP-OUTS	36%	-	38%
DROP-OUTS	36%	50%	38%

RESPONDENTS WITH AN IMPROVE JOB SKILLS EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	66%	-	67%
STOP-OUTS	25%	-	23%
DROP-OUTS	9%	-	10%

IMPLICATIONS

ATTRITION

Previous research found that Forest Park's nonreturn rate was 43% This is slightly higher than the rate for the District as a whole. However, the survey findings suggest that a smaller percentage of Forest Park's nonreturning students have permanently dropped out. The implied attrition rate for the campus is 6% (14% of 43%), the same as that for the District as a whole (16% of 40%).

THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY

The stop-out percentage of 48% implies that 21% of Forest Park's Fall enrollment (48% of 40%) became part of its "invisible" student body in the Spring.

UNDOCUMENTED ACHIEVEMENT

The achievement percentage of 39% implies that 17% of the campus' Fall enrollment (39% of 43%) achieved non-degree goals.

SUBSET IMPLICATIONS

As is true for the District as a whole, the Forest Park findings imply that the differences between nonreturn rates for full time and part time students, previously determined to be respectively 22% and 47%, are due primarily to stop-outs and undocumented achievement, not attrition. When the nonreturn rates are multiplied by the corresponding drop-out, stop-out, and achievement percentages the results are as follows.

ENROLLMENT STATUS	ATTRITION RATE	PERCENTAGE JOINING THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY	PERCENTAGE WITH UNDOCUMENTED (NON-DEGREE) GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
FULL TIME	4%	13%	4%
PART TIME	6%	19%	22%

With one major exception, the findings imply that the differences between nonreturn rates for the various educational goal subsets are due primarily to stop-outs and undocumented goal achievement. The exception is found in the Career Training subset which has an implied attrition rate that is notably larger than the rates implied for other goals. The previously determined nonreturn rate for Career Training students is 50%, so the 36% drop-out percentage implies an attrition rate of 18% (36% of 50%). This is twice as large as the second highest rate and 6 times as large as the lowest rate. The full list of results from multiplying the nonreturn rate for each goal by the drop-out, stop-out, and achievement percentages is as follows.

GOAL	ATTRITION RATE	PERCENTAGE JOINING THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY	PERCENTAGE WITH UNDOCUMENTED (NON-DEGREE) GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
AAS	3%	23%	-
AA	9%	26%	-
CERTIFICATE	-	27%	20%
GENERAL TRANSFER	4%	31%	16%
PERSONAL INTEREST	3%	14%	41%
CAREER TRAINING	18%	18%	14%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	6%	17%	44%

CHAPTER 4
FLORISSANT VALLEY CAMPUS

FINDINGS

ALL RESPONDENTS

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	33%	15%	35%
STOP-OUTS	55%	62%	54%
DROP-OUTS	12%	23%	11%

RESPONDENTS WITH AN AAS EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	-	-	-
STOP-OUTS	83%	100%	81%
DROP-OUTS	18%	-	19%

RESPONDENTS WITH AN AA EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	-	-	-
STOP-OUTS	86%	50%	88%
DROP-OUTS	14%	50%	13%

RESPONDENTS WITH A CERTIFICATE EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	36%	-	44%
STOP-OUTS	46%	50%	44%
DROP-OUTS	18%	50%	13%

RESPONDENTS WITH A GENERAL TRANSFER EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	65%	-	67%
STOP-OUTS	35%	-	33%
DROP-OUTS	-	-	-

RESPONDENTS WITH A PERSONAL INTEREST EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	78%	50%	79%
STOP-OUTS	6%	-	7%
DROP-OUTS	17%	50%	14%

RESPONDENTS WITH A CAREER TRAINING EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	75%	100%	71%
STOP-OUTS	25%	-	29%
DROP-OUTS	-	-	-

RESPONDENTS WITH AN IMPROVE JOB SKILLS GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	44%	-	48%
STOP-OUTS	48%	-	43%
DROP-OUTS	9%	-	10%

IMPLICATIONS

ATTRITION

Combined with the previously determined nonreturn rate of 40% at the Florissant Valley campus, the 12% drop-out percentage implies an attrition rate of 5% (12% of 40%).

"INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY

The 55% stop-out percentage implies that 22% of Florissant Valley's Fall enrollment (55% of 40%) became part of the "invisible" student body in the Spring.

UNDOCUMENTED GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

The 33% achievement percentage implies that 13% of the Fall student body on this campus achieved non-degree goals.

SUBSET IMPLICATIONS

Combined with the previously determined enrollment status subset nonreturn rates of 20% for full time and 44% for part time students, the findings imply that attrition is the same in both subsets. The differences are found in stop-outs and undocumented achievement. The results of multiplying the nonreturn rates by the drop-out, stop-out, and achievement percentages are as follows.

ENROLLMENT STATUS	ATTRITION RATE	PERCENTAGE JOINING THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY	PERCENTAGE WITH UNDOCUMENTED (NON-DEGREE) GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
FULL TIME	5%	12%	3%
PART TIME	5%	24%	15%

In contrast to the District as a whole, the Florissant Valley findings for the educational goal subsets imply particularly high goal achievement among Career Training students and virtually no attrition from this subset. The results of multiplying the previously determined nonreturn rate for each goal subset by the corresponding drop-out, stop-out, and achievement percentages are as follows.

GOAL	ATTRITION RATE	PERCENTAGE JOINING THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY	PERCENTAGE WITH UNDOCUMENTED (NON-DEGREE) GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
AAS	5%	23%	-
AA	4%	26%	-
CERTIFICATE	9%	22%	17%
GENERAL TRANSFER	-	15%	27%
PERSONAL INTEREST	9%	3%	43%
CAREER TRAINING	-	14%	41%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	5%	29%	27%

CHAPTER 5
MERAMEC CAMPUS

FINDINGS

ALL RESPONDENTS

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	40%	31%	41%
STOP-OUTS	42%	41%	42%
DROP-OUTS	18%	28%	17%

RESPONDENTS WITH AN AAS EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	4%	-	6%
STOP-OUTS	75%	40%	83%
DROP-OUTS	21%	60%	11%

RESPONDENTS WITH AN AA EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	5%	25%	-
STOP-OUTS	80%	50%	87%
DROP-OUTS	15%	25%	13%

RESPONDENTS WITH A CERTIFICATE EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	24%	22%	30%
STOP-OUTS	48%	44%	40%
DROP-OUTS	29%	33%	30%

RESPONDENTS WITH A GENERAL TRANSFER EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	49%	38%	54%
STOP-OUTS	37%	50%	33%
DROP-OUTS	14%	13%	13%

RESPONDENTS WITH A PERSONAL INTEREST EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	55%	-	56%
STOP-OUTS	27%	-	22%
DROP-OUTS	18%	-	22%

RESPONDENTS WITH A CAREER TRAINING EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	50%	100%	43%
STOP-OUTS	22%	-	29%
DROP-OUTS	28%	-	29%

RESPONDENTS WITH AN IMPROVE JOB SKILLS EDUCATIONAL GOAL

	ALL	FULL TIME	PART TIME
GOAL ACHIEVERS	74%	100%	71%
STOP-OUTS	14%	-	16%
DROP-OUTS	11%	-	13%

IMPLICATIONS

ATTRITION

Combined with the 40% nonreturn rate determined by previous research, the 18% drop-out percentage implies a 7% attrition rate (18% of 40%) for the Meramec campus.

"INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY

The 42% stop-out percentage implies that 17% of Meramec's Fall enrollment (42% of 40%) joined its "invisible" student body in the Spring.

UNDOCUMENTED ACHIEVEMENT

The 40% achievement percentage implies that 16% of Meramec's Fall enrollment achieved non-degree goals.

SUBSET IMPLICATIONS

As was true for the District as a whole, differences between nonreturn rates for full time and part time students at Meramec appear to be due primarily to stop-outs and undocumented achievement, not attrition. When the enrollment status subset drop-out, stop-out, and achievement percentages are applied to the previously determined nonreturn rates of 20% for full time and 46% for part time students, the results are as follows.

ENROLLMENT STATUS	ATTRITION RATE	PERCENTAGE JOINING THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY	PERCENTAGE WITH UNDOCUMENTED (NON-DEGREE) GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
FULL TIME	6%	8%	6%
PART TIME	8%	19%	19%

As was also true for the District, Meramec's highest implied attrition rate within individual educational goal subsets is in the Career Training subset, while the highest achievement rate is in the Improve Job Skills subset. The full list of results from multiplying the previously determined nonreturn rates for each subset by the survey determined drop-out, stop-out, and achievement percentages are as follows.

GOAL	ATTRITION RATE	PERCENTAGE JOINING THE "INVISIBLE" STUDENT BODY	PERCENTAGE WITH UNDOCUMENTED (NON-DEGREE) GOAL ACHIEVEMENT
AAS	5%	19%	1%
AA	4%	21%	1%
CERTIFICATE	10%	17%	8%
GENERAL TRANSFER	5%	13%	17%
PERSONAL INTEREST	10%	15%	30%
CAREER TRAINING	13%	10%	23%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	7%	9%	47%

St. Louis Community College is striving to meet the varied goals of its many students. As a former (and perhaps future) SLCC student your response to this questionnaire can be extremely helpful, and will be used in the College's strategic planning. Thank you for your assistance.

****

1. Our records indicate that you were enrolled for the Fall 1985 semester with the following educational goal: PERSONAL INTEREST

   Did you accomplish your goal? YES _____ NO _____

2. If you did not accomplish your goal, please mark the reason or reasons you you did not re-enroll for the Spring, 1986 semester.

   _____CHANGED GOAL. Describe new goal_____
   _____

   _____COURSES NEEDED WERE NOT OFFERED

   _____COURSES NEEDED WERE NOT OFFERED AT CONVENIENT TIMES

   _____FINANCIAL REASONS

   _____ACADEMIC DIFFICULTIES

   _____ATTENDED ANOTHER INSTITUTION. Name of Institution_____
   _____

   _____DISSATISFIED WITH ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE. Indicate problem areas_____
   _____
   _____
   _____

   _____OTHER. Describe_____
   _____
   _____

3. How would you rate St. Louis Community College as an educational institution for students with your educational goals?

   EXCELLENT_____ GOOD_____ FAIR_____ POOR_____

4. How could St. Louis Community College better serve students with your educational goals?_____
   _____
   _____
   _____

5. Do you plan to re-enroll at St. Louis Community College in the future?

YES_____ NO_____ If yes, please check the semesters you plan to enroll.

FALL, 1986_____ -SPRING, 1987_____ FALL, 1987_____
OTHER (Specify)_____

6. Please answer the following demographic questions so that we can determine whether our sample matches the characteristics of the student population.

SEX

Female _____
Male _____

RESIDENCY

City of St. Louis_____
St. Louis County _____
Other, MO _____
Out of State _____

ETHNIC ORIGIN

Black _____
White _____
Other _____

AGE

Under 21 _____
21-25 _____
26-30 _____
31-35 _____
36-40 _____
41-50 _____
51-60 _____
Over 60 _____

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Employed
Full-time _____
Part-time _____
Unemployed
Seeking Work _____
Not Seeking Work _____

How many credit hours did you take in the Fall, 1985 semester?_____

Which St. Louis Community College location did you attend?_____

Were your courses primarily during the day or at night?_____

Did you attend St. Louis Community College prior to the Fall, 1985 semester?

YES_____ NO_____ If yes, please list the semesters and years you attende

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. FALL CLASSES BEGIN AT FOREST PARK, FLORISSANT VALLEY, AND MERAMEC ON AUGUST 25, 1986. PLEASE CALL FOR MORE INFORMATION.

********** FOREST PARK 644-9100 **********
********** FLORISSANT VALLEY 595-4200 **********
********** MERAMEC 966-7500 **********

APPENDIX II

St. Louis Community College

Administrative Center
5801 Wilson Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63110
Telephone 314/644-9550

July 21, 1986

Dear Friend:

A few weeks ago you received a questionnaire like the one enclosed with this letter. If you have already responded to that original mailing, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for helping us in our continuing effort to improve your community college. Please accept our thanks and disregard this second questionnaire.

If you have not yet returned a completed questionnaire, please take a moment to do so. Information about your experience at St. Louis Community College and how well your educational goals were served is an important input as your college strives to provide the best possible educational services to you and the community at large. Your time and effort in supplying this information will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Richard Tichenor

Richard Tichenor
Management Information Analyst
Institutional Research
& Planning
St. Louis Community College

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
DEC 11 1987